

Brad -

I strongly oppose any form of Rent Control for Mobile Home Parks in Lake County. It has been proven time and again that rent control:

Costs money for the county to administrate.

Reduces the quality of the existing mobile home parks in the county because owners have less incentive to maintain and improve their parks.

Reduces the incentive for new owners to buy MHPs in Lake County due to the restrictive rent control ordinance. (New owners generally improve the properties that they buy.)

Punishes existing owners who have held down their rents for many years to the benefit of the tenants.

Crushes any incentive for developers to build new Mobile Home Parks in Lake County.

Please do not approve any form of rent control for Lake County Mobile Home Parks.

Frank Rogers

On your Agenda today is a proposed rent control ordinance for MHParks. What business owners in Lake County would like is control on tax increases. With tax increases, insurance premiums up, water sewer PGE increases, etc it's difficult enough to generate a profit and stay in business.

With the COL in California sky high, Mobile Home Parks still remain the most affordable living in the state.

As a MH Park Owner in Lake County I am totally opposed to any kind of rent control on Mobile Home Parks that would continue to squeeze the profit margins of small business owners.

Sincerely Gary Kimmel
WMHP

Dear Supervisor Rasmussen,

I am writing of behalf of Lake Village Estates Mobile Home Community to express my opposition to the potential introduction of rent control for mobile home spaces in Lake County and to encourage the opening of a constructive dialogue between the county, residents, and park owners. We plan to own this asset for many decades, and we plan to create and foster a safe, clean, affordable, well-maintained, and well-operated mobile home community.

Although I do not know for this for sure, based on previous discussions with residents and Supervisor Crandall, I believe that the rent control proposal may be driven by a very small number of residents in our mobile home community. Over the past year, we have

met with Supervisor Crandall as well as approximately five residents of the park to discuss these matters.

I am actually very surprised that rent control is being considered by the County. I believe that the rents at Lake Village Estates and throughout Lake County are very affordable in comparison to other housing options. We purchased the park in November 2023 and since then have increased rents by 7% (a \$29 increase from \$420 to \$449) in 2024 and 5% (a \$23 increase from \$449 to \$472) in 2025. In addition, we have passed through a charge of \$13.65 for capital improvements with the owner paying this charge on the vacant spaces. We believe that these are very moderate increases considering the improvements we have made to the community. During this time, we have invested significantly in improving the park and the infrastructure including the following areas:

- Seal coated the roads
- Remodeled the kitchen and clubhouse
- Added a business center
- Remodeled the library
- Replaced over 1/3 of the perimeter fencing
- Installed five new mobile homes with six additional homes are order which uplifts the overall quality of the park significantly
- Replaced the septic pump
- Added security cameras
- Added a new gazebo to the pool area
- Upgraded the entrance gate
- Added significant exterior lighting
- Remodeled and sold six abandoned and dilapidated homes

In addition, we have worked extensively with the residents to effect clean up of the tenant spaces and enforcement of park rules. Although we have implemented rent increases that are slightly above inflation, the capital investments and the operations and management focus have resulted in a tremendously improved community which greatly benefits the quality of living for all residents and also significantly increases the value of the residents' homes.

The current rent at Lake Village Estates is \$472. I believe that this presents an extremely good value for the residents especially given the approximately \$350,000 median cost of single family home in the County and median two bedroom apartment rent of approximately \$1,540.

Before considering mobile home rent control, I would encourage you and the county staff to look at cities where mobile home rent control has been implemented. The result has often been the elimination of investment and a significant decline in the infrastructure and amenities. Furthermore, although some rent control ordinances contain provisions for residents to approve infrastructure improvements and / or fair returns provisions, the reality is that these mechanisms rarely work and do not result in investment, improvements, or repairs.

Thank you for your time and consideration to these points. We are very willing to further engage with the County and with our tenants in this discussion.

Sincerely,

Dear Supervisors,

I write you today about the upcoming agenda item related to mobile home park space-rent control.

My team operates multiple mobile home parks (MHPs) in Lake County, owned only by families, and representing a combined total of 154 spaces.

Like many other MHP owners and operators in Lake County, we have not only invested significantly and consistently in providing high quality, lower-cost housing – without a penny of public subsidy – we have moderated homeowner's rent increases for many years, despite the challenge of *significant inflation and skyrocketing insurance premiums*. Our average rent increases have consistently been tempered and fair. And we are not alone in moderating rents for our resident homeowners. In other words, *there is no crisis of MHP rents in Lake County*.

Our parks cannot survive with such drastic economic punishment as offered in this draft rent control ordinance. Having witnessed the effects of rent control in other jurisdictions, I can share that MHP rent control has devastating consequences for nearly all stakeholders. Not only do home prices abnormally and excessively inflate, shifting even more burden of higher and higher housing costs onto future homebuyers, but parks suffer less and less available capital for upgrades and improvements. Otherwise flourishing communities suffer from Rent Control. And the County becomes burdened by repeat and costly appeals for fair return, draining budgets for otherwise useful purposes.

Additionally, any notion of expanding housing stock is eliminated. A number of our MHPs are in the long and costly process of expanding spaces to accommodate more low-cost housing without a penny of public subsidy. When rent control is enacted, expansion plans are eliminated and housing providers look to other places to create more housing.

In many cases we have also offered privately-funded, *needs-based* rent subsidies in our parks. This costs the County nothing. It is a program that may continue, particularly as interest and needs arise. Hopefully other MHPs can continue to offer similar programs as self-funded gestures of goodwill within their communities. But such programs would be eliminated if the County enacts rent control.

Please oppose Rent Control – it is bad for Lake County.

Thank you for your time and consideration,

Andy

Chair Crandell, Vice Chair Rasmussen, Supervisor Sabatier, Supervisor Pyska and Supervisor Owen,

Thank you Chair Crandell for bringing this ordinance forward.

Many of our local mobile home parks are being bought by investment firms that view the mobile home parks as a good source of income with little regard for the well-being of residents. This is not unique to Lake County and has been happening for quite some time in many places.

Last month, in July 2025, Santa Barbara County passed a mobile home park ordinance that went into effect last week on August 14th with an additional overlay specifically for senior parks.

Santa Barbara County Ordinance : <https://content.civicplus.com/api/assets/1434a9e9-95a7-491a-aebe-ca5912036ac2>

Santa Barbara Ordinance Website : <https://www.countyofsb.org/4558/Senior-Mobile-Home-Park-Overlay-Ordinanc>

The Santa Barbara County ordinance was spurred by the same circumstances we are seeing take place in Lake County. Residents in mobile home parks purchased by investment firms suffer from rising costs that make the parks unaffordable and investors take advantage knowing that residents cannot afford to move their homes out of the park. If a resident could afford to move their mobile home, the likelihood of finding another park to accept a mobile home, especially older models, is slim to none. Once a mobile home is sold, the investment firm is able to raise rents with no cap on the percentage.

To put this into a perspective of what is happening right here in Lake County, the BoaVida Group has purchased several parks in Lake County over the last few years. To read through the BoaVida Group website raises a lot of concerns with what is happening with one of our last affordable options for many seniors and others with low or fixed incomes.

From BoaVida Group's website, I would like to bring your attention to some of the information they share for investors.

<https://www.theboavidagroup.com/investor-faqs/>

First is their profits for investors. On the link above, the third option on the page is for the "**BoaVida 2024 Funds Return**". There they state that their goal is to increase the asset value by 50% within 6 years. Additionally, the investor return rate is 14%. How is this possible without significant cost increases to some of our most vulnerable residents?

On that same page, under the "**Why Manufactured Housing**" tab, the investment firm describes the demand for affordable housing and how lucrative it is. Based on an income of \$43,000 rent could be up to \$1075/month and with an average lot rent of \$535/month, offering substantial room for rent increases.

It goes on to describe how they estimate that 60% to 70% of the aquisition price can depreciated through the Bonus Depreciation in the first year. Don't take my word for it. It's on their website.

<https://www.theboavidagroup.com/investor-faqs/>

I kindly ask all of you to take less than 13 minutes and watch this video link below which describes some of the loopholes these investment firms are using and how they are hurting vulnerable residents all over the country. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=iH3Pz8_3DYQ

This is bigger than Lake County or even California; it is a nationwide issue. Your Board can make meaningful change locally for a lot of lives and give residents of mobile home parks the security that they will not be priced out from living in their investment.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Angela Amaral
District 3 Resident

Dear Supervisor Rasmussen,

I am writing to express serious concerns about the proposed Rent Stabilization Ordinance. While the measure is well-intentioned, it will harm the very residents it seeks to protect. Lake County already has some of the most affordable mobile home options in the state.

By artificially capping rent increases, the ordinance discourages maintaining mobile home parks, leading to deteriorating infrastructure, and decreased housing as existing homes older units get scrapped.

- Expenses to maintain the properties are rising much faster than the rent cap. For example, insurance costs in California have skyrocketed due to state mismanagement and wildfire losses. If a rent-controlled park experienced any damage from fire, it would not be financially viable to repair a rent-controlled the park.
- Limiting rent growth reduces the already limited supply of affordable housing in Lake County, displacing residents. If a mobile home becomes uninhabitable or damaged, it does not make sense to replace it with another rent-controlled unit. There are already numerous vacant spots in Lake County which show that installing new homes is not viable with current regulations.
- Finally, the ordinance imposes an additional layer of costly regulation and bureaucracy on property owners and the county. Administrative fees, compliance requirements, and petition processes add complexity without addressing the root issue—Lake County's shortage of housing.

Instead of restricting rents, policymakers should focus on increasing housing supply through incentives for development, streamlining approvals, and supporting new affordable housing projects. This approach would protect vulnerable residents without undermining investment and housing quality.

Sincerely,
Deryck O'Brien

Kelsey Creek Mobile Home Park

Dear Supervisor Rasmussen,

I am writing to express **serious concerns about the proposed Rent Stabilization Ordinance**. While the measure is well-intentioned, it will harm the very residents it seeks to protect. Lake County already has some of the most affordable mobile home options in the state.

By artificially capping rent increases, the ordinance discourages maintaining mobile home parks, leading to deteriorating infrastructure, and decreased housing as existing homes older units get scrapped.

- **Expenses to maintain the properties** are rising much faster than the rent cap. For example, **insurance costs in California** have skyrocketed due to state mismanagement and wildfire losses. If a rent-controlled park experienced any damage from fire, it would not be financially viable to repair a rent-controlled the park.
- **Limiting rent growth** reduces the already limited supply of affordable housing in Lake County, displacing residents. If a mobile home becomes uninhabitable or damaged, it does not make sense to replace it with another rent-controlled unit. There are already numerous vacant spots in Lake County which show that installing new homes is not viable with current regulations.
- Finally, the ordinance **imposes an additional layer of costly regulation and bureaucracy** on property owners and the county. Administrative fees, compliance requirements, and petition processes add complexity without addressing the root issue—Lake County's shortage of housing.

Instead of restricting rents, policymakers should focus on increasing housing supply through incentives for development, streamlining approvals, and supporting new affordable housing projects. This approach would protect vulnerable residents without undermining investment and housing quality.

Sincerely,

Linda K Sherwood

Kelsey Creek Mobile Home Park

Dear Supervisor Rasmussen,

I am writing to express serious concerns about the **proposed Rent Stabilization Ordinance**. While the measure is well-intentioned, it will harm the very residents it seeks to protect. Lake County already has some of the most affordable mobile home options in the state.

By artificially capping rent increases, the ordinance discourages maintaining mobile home parks, leading to deteriorating infrastructure, and decreased housing as existing homes older units get scrapped.

- **Expenses to maintain the properties are rising much faster than the rent cap.** For example, insurance costs in California have skyrocketed due to state mismanagement and wildfire losses. If a rent-controlled park experienced any damage from fire, it would not be financially viable to repair a rent-controlled the park.
- **Limiting rent growth reduces the already limited supply of affordable housing** in Lake County, displacing residents. If a mobile home becomes uninhabitable or damaged, it does not make sense to replace it with another rent-

controlled unit. There are already numerous vacant spots in Lake County which show that installing new homes is not viable with current regulations.

- Finally, the ordinance **imposes an additional layer of costly regulation and bureaucracy on property owners and the county.** Administrative fees, compliance requirements, and petition processes add complexity without addressing the root issue—Lake County's shortage of housing.

Instead of restricting rents, policymakers should **focus on increasing housing supply through incentives for development**, streamlining approvals, and supporting new affordable housing projects. This approach would protect vulnerable residents without undermining investment and housing quality.

Sincerely,
Joseph J Sherwood

Kelsey Creek Mobile Home Park